



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,655	09/18/2003	William R. Dorow JR.	ROC920030152US1	8564
46296	7590	08/23/2006	EXAMINER	
MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC			LU, CHARLES EDWARD	
P.O. BOX 548			ART UNIT	
CARTHAGE, MO 64836-0548			PAPER NUMBER	

2163

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/665,655

Applicant(s)

DOROW ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E. Lu

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-23 and 25-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-23 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment/Response to Arguments

1. This Action is in response to the amendment dated 6/21/2006. Claims 6 and 24 are cancelled. Claims 1-5, 7-23, and 25-28 are pending. Claims 1-5, 7-23, and 25-28 are rejected.

2. Remarks concerning the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection for claims 1-28 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is maintained for the non-cancelled claims, seen below:

3. Remarks concerning the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection for claims 1-28 have been fully considered. In light of Applicant's remarks, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection is withdrawn for claims 9-16. The 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection is maintained for claims 1-5, 7-8, 17-23, and 25-28, seen below:

4. Arguments regarding the prior art rejection have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

As to the argument that Hoskins does not teach or suggest "a data driven framework mechanism that causes a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information," the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant has requested a detailed mapping of "thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the platform independent configuration selection model". Reference is made to col. 25, ll. 1-54, col. 33, l. 52 – col. 34, l. 34 of the previous action. For example, referring to col. 34, ll. 17-34, Hoskins teaches how a

Art Unit: 2163

change in external data would be autonomically reflected in a configuration selection model. See fig. 14, which is pertinent to the cited text. The “platform independent” limitation is previously addressed in the rejection of claim 1. Thus, a detailed mapping of “thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the platform independent configuration selection model” has been provided.

As to the argument that Hoskins does not teach or suggest, “framework mechanism that autonomically adds a new product to a hierarchy of information in the framework based on the data related to the new product”, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

For example, in previously cited col. 81, l. 9 – col. 83, l. 15), a “Control Assembly 1st Clamps” is added to the “Control Resources” tree panel (see col. 82, l. 25-26). This is a teaching of the above claimed subject matter.

Therefore, the prior art rejection is maintained using the art of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of the following:

As to claim 1, the claim does not recite changing any data. Rather, the claim recites, “thereby causing a change... to be reflected.” No change has actively taken place. Therefore, the claim still appears to have no useful, concrete, and tangible

Art Unit: 2163

result. Furthermore, the claim as a whole appears to be drawn to an abstract idea, rather than a tangible one. For example, a change being “reflected” in the hierarchy is purely an abstract idea.

As to claim 2, it is reasonably interpreted that the hierarchy (line 2) may or may not be displayed by the platform-dependent graphical user interface, and therefore, claim 2 does not provide a useful, concrete, and tangible result. Additionally, claim 2 inherits the deficiencies of claim 1.

Claims 3-5 and 7 are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of parent claim 1 and fail to cure them.

Claims 8-9 are rejected for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they depend from rejected claim 9 and fail to cure its deficiencies.

Claim 15 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 9.

Claim 16 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 2.

As to claim 17, the claimed program product is reasonably interpreted as being on a signal (see specification, p. 13, first paragraph), which is non-statutory (See Interim Guidelines).

As to claims 18 and 19, because the specification merely provides examples of recordable and transmission media, and the claims require a signal bearing media, it is reasonably interpreted that claims 18 and 19 intend to cover signals, which are non-statutory.

Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they depend from rejected claim 17 and fail to cure its deficiencies.

Claims 25-28 are rejected for similar reasons as claims 17-25.

The art rejection of the above claims is applied in anticipation of Applicant amending the claims to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 17-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the logic in the framework mechanism” in line 10. Though the framework mechanism may define logic (line 8), it does not mean that the logic is in the framework mechanism (emphasis added). There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the hierarchy of information...model” in line 3. Though the product configuration selection model may define a hierarchy of information (line 6), it does not mean that the hierarchy is in the product configuration selection model (emphasis added).

Claims 2-5 and 7 are rejected because of their dependency on rejected claim 1.

As to claim 8, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the “the logic in the framework mechanism” in line 12 and “the hierarchy of information...model” in line 15. Also see above reasoning.

As to claim 17, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the logic in the framework mechanism” in line 7. Also see above reasoning. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the hierarchy of information...model” in line 3. Also see above reasoning.

Claims 18-23 and 25 are rejected because of their dependency on rejected claim 17.

As to claim 26, there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the logic in the framework mechanism” in line 7, and “the hierarchy of information...model” in line 10. See above reasoning.

Claims 27-28 are rejected because of their dependency on rejected claim 26.

The broadest reasonable interpretation of the above terms in light of the specification has been given to the claims. Art rejection of the above claims is applied as best understood in light of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, discussed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Art Unit: 2163

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 7-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoskins et al (U.S. Patent 6,167,406).

As to claim 1, Hoskins et al teaches the claimed subject matter including:

At least one processor (col. 7, ll. 1-20);

A memory coupled to the at least one processor (col. 7, ll. 1-20);

An object oriented framework mechanism (e.g., col. 10, l. 6 – col. 11, l. 50). The framework mechanism is software that has to reside in the memory and be executed by the processor, since this is a computer software system.

The framework mechanism comprising a product configuration selection model (col. 4, ll. 50-62, col. 16, ll. 1-17, col. 32, ll. 30-60 and related text on “Designer Studio”) that defines a hierarchy of information (col. 32, ll. 50-60) that may be presented to a user for product configuration selection determination (see fig. 8); and

That defines logic (e.g., col. 33, l. 25 – col. 34, l. 34) that specifies at least one relationship between items in the hierarchy of information (also see related fig. 14);

The logic operating on data stored external to the framework mechanism (col. 25, l. 1 – col. 26, l. 4, fig. 5a, col. 33, l. 52 – col. 34, l. 34) thereby achieving a separation between the logic in the framework mechanism and the data upon which the logic in the framework mechanism operates.

Hoskins does not expressly teach a platform independent product configuration selection model.

However, Hoskins teaches utilizing Java, C, and C++ languages (e.g., col. 7, ll. 21-30). Hoskins further discusses that Java is an architecture neutral and platform independent language (col. 12, ll. 29-40). Therefore, the platform configuration selection model could be written in Java, making the model architecture neutral and platform independent as described above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Hoskins with the above teachings, such that the model is platform independent. The motivation would have been to allow the model to be interpreted on different kinds of computer systems, as known to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Hoskins as modified further teaches wherein the logic operates on the external data, thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model (e.g., col. 25, ll. 1-54, col. 33, l. 52 – col. 34, l. 34).

As to claim 2, Hoskins of claim 1 further teaches a platform dependent graphical user interface (note usage of C++, col. 16, ll. 1-3, col. 80, ll. 15-20) that uses the framework mechanism to display the hierarchy of information to the user (see above).

As to claim 3, claim 4, and claim 5, Hoskins of claim 1 further teaches wherein the hierarchy includes at least one page, one selection group, and one selection item in each selection group (note the features in the graphical user interface, e.g., fig. 8 and throughout the document).

As to claim 7, Hoskins of claim 1 further teaches wherein the framework mechanism comprises a plurality of extensible object oriented classes (e.g., col. 8, ll. 16-34, col. 9, ll. 37-42, note that Hoskins is programmed in an object oriented language).

Claim 8 is rejected because it contains the subject matter already addressed for claim 1, in addition to a database residing in the memory, the database including product configuration selection data (see "enterprise control database", col. 14, l. 57, col. 16, ll. 17-22, col. 33, l. 52 – col. 34, l. 34) and the logic operating on the product configuration selection data in the database (e.g., col. 16, ll. 1-22), both taught by Hoskins.

Claim 9 is rejected because it is drawn to a method containing the subject matter already addressed for claim 1, in addition to updating the product information selection data to include data related to a new product (col. 81, l. 9 – col. 83, l. 15, col. 82, ll. 24-32) and the framework mechanism autonomically adding the new product to the

hierarchy of information based on the data related to the new product (col. 82, ll. 24-32), both taught by Hoskins.

As to claim 10, Hoskins of claim 9 does not expressly teach extending at least one class in the framework mechanism.

However, Hoskins teaches that it is possible to extend and modify objects (classes) through deriving new kinds of objects from the standard classes available in the system (col. 9, ll. 37-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hoskins with the above teachings, such that a class in the framework is extended. The motivation would have been to create new capabilities without starting from scratch, as taught by Hoskins (col. 9, ll. 42-43).

Claims 11-16 are rejected because they are drawn to methods containing subject matter already addressed above with respect to claims 2-5 and 12-14.

Claim 17 is rejected because it is a program product containing the same subject matter as claim 1 addressed above, in addition to a computer readable signal bearing media (e.g., memory of Hoskins, fig. 1A) bearing the framework mechanism.

As to claim 18, Hoskins further teaches wherein the signal bearing media comprises recordable media (see memory of Hoskins, fig. 1A).

As to claim 19, Hoskins of claim 17 further teaches wherein the signal bearing media comprises transmission media (e.g., see bus of fig. 1A).

Claims 20-23 and 25 are rejected because they are drawn to program products containing subject matter already addressed above with respect to claims 2-7.

Claim 26 is rejected because it is a program product containing the same subject matter as claim 8 addressed above, in addition to computer readable signal bearing media bearing the framework mechanism, also addressed above.

Claims 27-28 are rejected because they are drawn to program products containing subject matter already addressed above with respect to claims 18-19.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Lu whose telephone number is (571) 272-8594. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00; M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CL
Assistant Examiner
AU 2163
8/17/2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Don Wong", with a stylized, looping flourish at the end.

DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100